

REMARKS

Claims 1-52 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The examiner has requested that the priority information be correctly set forth in the specification. Applicants are amending herewith the specification of the present application to correctly reflect the priority information.

Claims 12 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejection states that Claim 12 indicates that “acrylic acid” is not required in an acrylic acid terpolymer, which is impossible. Applicant is amending Claim 1 and 12 so that acrylic acid is optional. The rejection states that in Claim 32 there is no antecedent basis for the term “personal care product.” Applicants are amending Claim 31 so that it depends from Claim 30, which provides antecedent basis for the term “personal care product.” Applicants submit that, as amended, Claims 1 and 31 are now not indefinite. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1-52 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of co-pending application Serial No. 09/900,698. Claims 1-52 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of co-pending application Serial No. 09/564,424. Claims 1-52 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of co-pending application Serial No. 09/564,780. Claims 1-52


Serial No. 10/006,825

were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of co-pending application Serial No. 09/564,837. Claims 1-52 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of co-pending application Serial No. 09/565,125. Since these are all provisional rejections, applicants submit that no terminal disclaimer is necessary. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the provisional rejections of Claims 1-52 on the basis of obviousness-type double patenting be withdrawn.

Applicants are voluntarily amending the claims herewith, as set forth above, to more clearly define that invention and to provide consistency in claim terminology and format. Applicants submit that these amendments do not add new matter and that support for these amendments can be found throughout the present application.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing remarks. Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Such action is courteously solicited. Applicants further request that the Examiner call the undersigned counsel if allowance of the claims can be facilitated by examiner's amendment, telephone interview or otherwise.

Respectfully submitted,


Robert E. Richards
Reg. No. 29,105

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Tel: (404) 815-6500
Our Docket: 11302-0945 (44040-275991)
KS# 15,942.1